

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 062

CS 504 481

AUTHOR Kearney, Patricia; And Others  
TITLE Power in the Classroom III: Teacher Communication Techniques and Messages.  
PUB DATE Nov 83  
NOTE 31p.; For related documents, see ED 215 389 and ED 225 218.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Behavior Patterns; \*Classroom Communication; \*Classroom Techniques; \*Communication Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Individual Power; Speech Communication; Speech Instruction; \*Student Teacher Relationship; \*Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics  
IDENTIFIERS \*Teacher Power

## ABSTRACT

As part of a research project on teacher power in the classroom, a study examined behavior alteration techniques (BATs) and behavior representative messages (BAMs) used by elementary and secondary school teachers in classroom management. In the first phase of the study, 177 college students generated lists of BATs and BAMs, and then, working in groups, arranged them in categories. In the second phase, 18 BATs with sample BAMs were taken from the lists and used to generate an instrument that was administered to 204 public school teachers, who indicated how often they used each to get their students to change behavior and how effective they were in achieving this. They also indicated how often their students used the same techniques in getting them to change behavior. Results showed that the teachers relied primarily on reward-type BATs. They also reported that their students did not frequently employ any of the BATs to change teacher behavior. Potential predictors of differential teacher use of BATs were not found to be meaningful. (The list of BATs and BAMs is appended.) (FL)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

POWER IN THE CLASSROOM III:  
TEACHER COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES AND MESSAGES

by

Patricia Kearney

Timothy G. Plax

Virginia P. Richmond

James C. McCroskey\*

Department of Speech Communication  
West Virginia University  
Morgantown, WV 26506  
(304) 293-3905

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Kearney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

\*Patricia Kearney (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1979) is Assistant Professor and Timothy G. Plax (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1974), and Virginia P. Richmond (Ph.D., University of Nebraska, 1977) are Associate Professors of Speech Communication at West Virginia University. James C. McCroskey (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) is Chairperson and Professor in the same Department.

POWER IN THE CLASSROOM III:  
TEACHER COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES AND MESSAGES

Abstract

This study is a third in a series of investigations concerned with teacher power in the classroom. The focus of this project was on the generation of an extended list of power strategies or behavior alteration techniques (BATs) and representative messages (BAMs) that elementary and secondary teachers use and perceive as effective in managing student behavior. Students generated lists of universal BATs and BAMs unrestricted by hypothetical relationships or scenarios. From these lists, 18 BATs with sample BAMs were derived and submitted for examination by public school teachers. Results indicated that teachers frequently use and perceive 7 BATs as effective. These findings suggest that teachers rely primarily on reward-type BATs and that they frequently make use of the student's "audience" to effect change. The 7 substantially extend and redefine existing power strategies. Teachers also reported that their students did not frequently employ any of those BATs to change teacher behavior. Potential predictors of differential teacher use of BATs were not found to be meaningful. Interpretations of the obtained BATs for classroom management are discussed and the continued research program is outlined.

POWER IN THE CLASSROOM III:  
TEACHER COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES AND MESSAGES

Teachers today are still trying to educate students despite the growing numbers of learning-related problems which occur in the classroom. In the last 20 years, instruction has been notably restrained by a widespread student resistance to learning and authority. Discipline in the public schools has been reported as the number one problem facing educators (Gallup, 1977; Check, 1979). Teachers are further challenged by student apathy and generally negative attitudes toward school (c.f., Branan, 1972; Check, 1979). While sociologists have traced potential social, economic, political, and family correlates of this "changing child," elementary and secondary teachers are ultimately accountable to parental and administrative demands for student achievement (Spillman, 1980). As a result, an effective teacher is one who must be able to 1) maximize cognitive learning, 2) manage a classroom environment which promotes positive student attitudes toward learning (c.f., Wittich & Schuller, 1973; Andersen, 1979; Kearney & McCroskey, 1980), and 3) minimize student disruptions that interfere with learning objectives (Emmer & Evertson, 1981; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983).

In short, teachers are obligated and finally, primarily responsible for producing an educated child. Educators must assume student control in an effort to optimize classroom environments conducive to learning. Student control involves influencing students to cooperate in the learning process. In the classroom then, the teacher must strategically communicate messages that compel students to engage in learning.

Interestingly, teacher training programs have emphasized content competencies for instructional credentials--almost to the exclusion of communication competencies and classroom management skills (Kearney & McCroskey, 1980; Spillman, 1980).

The first-year teacher quickly discovers that he/she is ill-prepared to manage the actual dynamics of classroom teaching. Discovering that students are not all enamored with the "love for learning" has oftentimes resulted in teacher disillusionment. Indeed, approximately one-third of all "new" teachers drop out of their profession within the first three years (Mouly, 1973). In a less extreme and more constructive response to the contemporary student, teachers and instructional researchers alike are attempting to isolate techniques which will contribute to a well-managed classroom. We now realize that knowledge of content material is an insufficient condition to instruction. The practicing teacher must learn the communication strategies that can control student behaviors requisite for learning.

#### The Research Program

This study is the third in a series of studies designed to explore the teacher's use of power strategies in managing the classroom. Power strategies allow a teacher the capacity to influence students to do something they would not have done had they not been influenced (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press). When teachers exert communicative control over their students, they purposively attempt to affect or change their classroom behavior. In this way, power strategies are behavior alteration techniques which teachers use to control or modify student actions. If power strategies are not employed, the teacher's ability to enhance student learning is reduced. Thus, power strategies are critical to teaching effectiveness and classroom management.

In sequence, Study I examined whether teachers and students have shared perceptions of the frequency and type of power strategies employed in the classroom (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). Study II focused on the relationship between the teacher's use of power and students' cognitive and affective learning

(Richmond & McCroskey, in press). This third study was designed to further explore the use of power in the classroom by extending the existing typology of power strategies that teachers use and perceive as effective. The end result of this investigation is a classification of behavior alteration techniques and representative behavior alteration messages which teachers can employ in managing students in the classroom. The research and thinking in the areas of power and classroom management provided directions for the present study.

#### Classroom Management

In the instructional literature, teacher power or control strategies are subsumed within the classroom management area. Classroom management encompasses those teacher behaviors which "produce high levels of student involvement in classroom activities, minimal amounts of student behaviors that interfere with the teacher's or students' work, and efficient use of instructional time" (Emmer & Evertson, 1981, p. 342). Researchers have examined a wide range of teacher behaviors in their efforts to understand those factors which contribute to the effectively managed classroom. Among those variables studied, classroom structure, lesson format and learning activities, teacher leadership skills, and a variety of behavior alteration techniques are the most salient. Examples from recent research illustrate components of each of these areas.

In terms of classroom structure, rules and procedures must be specific and clearly defined (Borg & Ascione, 1979); generated by both students and teachers (Spillman, 1980); with sufficient time spent at the beginning of the school year socializing students to rule adoption (Evertson & Anderson, 1979; Emmer & Evertson, 1980). Research on lesson format and learning activities indicates that teacher-led group activities versus individual seatwork assignments create more on-task behaviors (Good & Beckerman, 1978); and student-paced

activities that employ a highly structured programmed format ensure greater task persistence (Kounin & Gump, 1974). Teacher leadership skills that optimize classroom management include prompts (Krantz & Scarth, 1979), positive questioning techniques (Borg & Ascione, 1979), motivational statements and structured versus unstructured transitions (Arlin, 1979). While all these strategies are important in initiating and maintaining student involvement and on-task behaviors, an additional criterial variable for classroom management appears to be those control strategies that teachers employ to change student behaviors. That is, what messages do teachers use to encourage students to comply with teacher demands?

Most relevant to this project is the research on behavior alteration techniques. Typical investigations in this area have recommended the use of token economy, behavioral contracts (Harris, 1972), extinction, reinforcement, time-outs (Shrigley, 1979), incentive systems (Emmer & Evertson, 1981), specification of consequences (Breuning, 1978), and teacher "with-itness" or the ability to immediately identify and desist inappropriate student behaviors (Kounin, 1970). Overall, this research indicates that effective classroom managers should employ behavior alteration techniques that emphasize primarily positive, rather than aversive teacher-controlled contingencies. These strategies are rooted in operant conditioning or behavior modification approaches.

Contrary to these recommendations, teachers continually report difficulty employing such techniques for numerous reasons: 1) Implementation of behavior modification, token economy, etc. require individual contingency specifications and teacher "with-itness." Such identification and scrutiny become increasingly difficult with large numbers of students; 2) Teachers report an unwillingness or skepticism with the use of only positive strategies for student control. Instead, teachers indicate a "preference" for aversive strategies

to control student misbehavior (Siggers, 1980). There remains an inconsistency between what researchers say teachers should do and what teachers prefer to do or what can be realistically and practically employed in the traditional classroom. While the current instructional literature focuses on primarily positive alteration techniques, teachers need an extended typology which offers a greater diversity of strategies for managing their classrooms efficiently and effectively and which affords teachers greater flexibility. Thus, it is important to isolate those behavior alteration techniques that are actually employed and are perceived as effective by teachers in the classroom.

#### Power

A particularly relevant typology that has been examined in the instructional communication literature focuses on the use of teacher power. In the context of classroom management, power-based strategies contribute to the teacher's ability to maximize student on-task behaviors and to minimize student disruptions that interfere with the learning process. Teacher power differs from typical classroom management strategies referenced in the instructional literature. While classroom structure, teacher leadership skills, and lesson format/learning activities, and other classroom variables work in combination to orchestrate optimal conditions for learning, even the most effectively designed learning environments may suffer from student disruptions and resistances. These deviances require concurrent teacher attempts to change student behavior. Teacher power affects student behavior change as a direct result of his/her influence (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). This distinction is consistent with French and Raven's (1968) five bases of power.

McCroskey and Richmond (1983) interpret these bases of power in the classroom. In overview, teacher's coercive power is based on student perceptions that he/she will be punished by the teacher if he/she fails to conform to the teacher's influence attempt. A teacher's reward power refers to student expectations that he/she will be rewarded (positive or negative reinforcement) if he/she complies with the teacher's influence attempt. Legitimate or assigned power is based on student perceptions that the teacher has a right to make demands. Referent power is based on the student's desire to comply with the teacher's influence attempt in order to please or identify with the teacher. Finally, expert power is based on the student's willingness to comply because the teacher is perceived as competent and knowledgeable in specific areas.

In the first of this series of studies, McCroskey and Richmond (1983) determined the degree to which teachers and students share perceptions of the types and proportion of power usage teachers employ in their classrooms. Their results, based on junior high, senior high, and college instructors and their students, indicated that teachers and students share similar, but not isomorphic perceptions of power use. Both teachers and students reported that reward, referent, and expert power were employed more frequently than either coercive or legitimate power. Interestingly, students further perceived that teachers used a higher proportion of coercive power than did teachers, while teachers perceived they used more expert power than did their students.

In the second study, Richmond and McCroskey (in press) examined the relationship between types/usage of teacher power in the classroom and student affective and cognitive learning. Based on responses from a similar sample, it was concluded that "communication of power has a major association with student learning" (Richmond & McCroskey, in press). Teacher use of coercive,

and, to a lesser extent, legitimate power, was shown to be negatively associated with cognitive and affective learning. In contrast, teacher use of referent and, to a lesser extent, expert power, was positively associated with both types of student learning. Based on the results of both Study I and Study II (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press), a well-managed classroom does, indeed, require the use of teacher power in gaining student compliance, which may in turn, impact learning. Specifically, teacher use of referent and expert power in the classroom significantly and positively affects learning outcomes. While the instructional literature suggests that student control strategies are essential to effectively managed classrooms as well, recommendations are for primarily positive teacher-controlled contingencies. In terms of French and Raven's (1968) typology of power bases, those behavior alteration strategies most closely approximate reward power. Curiously, the use of reward power (Study II) was found to have little or no meaningful association with student learning (Richmond & McCroskey, in press). This result, coupled with teachers' reported reluctance/disenchantment with the use of reward appeals (Siggers, 1980), questions the efficacy and utility of this technique.

#### Research Questions

What behavior alteration techniques can teachers reasonably and realistically employ in the traditional classroom? There is no simple answer to this question. While the educational literature overwhelmingly supports numerous positive strategies of student control, the evidence indicates that actual teachers find such theoretical applications difficult or impractical to implement. Recent research from the instructional communication arena casts some doubt on the exclusive emphasis of teacher-initiated reward strategies in affecting student

learning outcomes. This same research, however, limits teacher use of power strategies to only referent, and to a lesser extent, expert power. An over-reliance on a single strategy (e.g., referent) restricts teacher options in their managing of heterogeneous groups. Faced with an elementary or secondary classroom which may range in class size from 15 to 40 students, an individual teacher may require numerous and diverse strategies. Thus the present study (Study III) was designed to extend the existing list of student behavior alteration techniques available and effective for classroom use. Research Question 1 reflects this concern:

Research Question 1: What types of behavior alteration techniques do teachers perceive they frequently use and find effective in controlling student behavior in the classroom?

While the primary concern of this third study focused on types, uses and effectiveness of student control techniques that are available to teachers in the classroom, additional issues were addressed. Given that students may be resistant to teacher influence attempts or demand a sense of shared influence in classroom management, students may employ similar control techniques on their teachers. Therefore,

Research Question 2: Do teachers perceive their students employing similar and effective behavior alteration techniques to affect teacher behavior?

Finally, since it has been shown that teachers do employ control strategies in classroom management, the types of strategies selected and their perceived effectiveness may be a function of relevant teacher variables. Therefore,

Research Question 3: Are teachers' perceived selection and effectiveness of behavior alteration techniques a function of instructor gender, number of years teaching, grade level taught, or teacher satisfaction with their profession?

## METHODS

Phase I required the identification of a range and diversity of behavior alteration techniques available for teacher use in the classroom. An examination of the compliance-gaining literature (c.f., Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977; Cody, McLaughlin, & Jordan, 1980; and Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman & Georgacarakos, 1982), failed to provide sufficient and exhaustive message categorizations applicable to teachers in the classroom. Whereas investigators have typically accepted the completeness and generalizability of previously defined typologies, we argue that strategies employed in the classroom may be qualitatively different from those employed in non-instructional contexts. The classroom setting, task-oriented objectives, and teacher accountability all contribute to and mediate the types of control strategies selected.

That is, teachers may employ behavior alteration techniques that rely on "student audience effects." For instance, concurrent praise, a recommended control strategy in the instructional literature, obtains student compliance by praising the non-disruptive student while avoiding direct confrontation with disruptive students (Borg & Ascione, 1979). Second, teachers may anchor their strategies in messages which reflect a sense of responsibility--knowing that desist messages may impact not only the non-compliant student but also other members of the class. Third, classroom environments are task-oriented. Students are expected to learn and like what they are learning. Consequently, the behavior alteration techniques teachers employ must consider students' affective responses to on-task compliance. Fourth, such strategies employed with students must meet appropriate and acceptable standards of classroom conduct. Teachers are not only accountable to students, but also to administrators and parents. In-class teacher attempts to alter student behavior then, may

be quite different from compliance-gaining strategies found in friendships, marital dyads, neighbors, etc.

Following this thinking, Phase I of this study isolated an open-ended pool of behavior alteration techniques unrestricted by either inappropriate relational or situational scenarios. A sample of 177 college students enrolled in various communication classes generated individual lists of messages in response to the following instructions: "People try to get other people to do things they may not want to do. The other person usually thinks and often asks, 'Why should I do this?' Give us the most common answers you'd give to this question, such as, 'It'll be good for you,' or 'You will lose a lot if you don't.'" This open-ended question with the purposeful omission of hypothetical scenarios served to elicit a wide range of responses. Approximately 2,500 messages were generated from this sample.

After individual messages were generated, students were then grouped (group size ranged from 4-7 members; total group N=39), and asked to discuss and categorize their responses with the following instructions: "The task for your group is to take the statements each individual has come up with and try to put them into categories (i.e., groups of statements that seem to be quite a bit alike). Then, try to give each group of statements a label or name." This procedure allowed subjects to inductively derive categories of control strategies. Approximately 150 categories were generated.

Given the overlap in both messages and categories derived from this sample, the authors of the study, serving as coders, independently and then jointly, derived 18 representative behavior alteration techniques (BATs) or categories. Our coding revealed that each category was best represented by a combination of statements or behavior alteration messages (BAMs). While any individual message alone did not totally represent a given category,

messages in configuration provided a meaningful conceptual classification. As expected, the resulting 18 BATs and representative BAMs provided some overlap with previously defined compliance-gaining and power strategies, but offered several other categories extending the range and diversity of potential strategies (see Table 1).

In Phase 2 an instrument was generated and administered to 204 elementary and secondary teachers enrolled in instructional communication graduate classes. Based in part on the categories obtained in Phase 1, this instrument included sections requesting that the teachers provide several types of information. In the first section, the unlabeled behavior alteration techniques (BATs) with representative message groupings (BAMs) were presented for examination. The teachers were asked to respond on a 5-point scale, how often they used each grouping of BAMs to get their students to change their behavior and how effectively such statements were in getting their students to change. Using the same message groupings, the next section requested that the teachers indicate how frequently and how effectively they felt that their students employed such statements in getting their teacher to change his/her behavior. In the final section of the instrument, teachers responded to a 4-item measure of job satisfaction<sup>1</sup>, and indicated the number of years they had been teaching, the grade level they usually teach, and gender. Teacher responses to the entire instrument provided the data for analyses in the present study.

#### ANALYSES AND RESULTS

In order to answer each research question, preliminary analyses of the 18 behavior alteration techniques were required to ensure the assumption of independence. That is, since teachers responded to categories of message groupings or statement configurations instead of individual items for each

category, no clear factor solution was expected. In order to substantiate this assumption, each of four sets of data were factored separately: teacher use, teacher effectiveness, student use, and student effectiveness. As expected, no single or multiple factor solutions were obtained. Correlations among the 18 BATs for each data set further confirmed that the categories, while somewhat related, were best interpreted to be 18 independent solutions. Consequently, further tests of the proposed research questions required separate analyses of each BAT.

Question 1 focused on what types of BATs teachers actually use and find effective in controlling student behavior in the classroom. For a BAT to be included as those actually used by teachers, two criteria were imposed: mean responses must be above 3.0 and frequency scores must be above 60%. This procedure ensured that representative categories illustrated at least above occasional use by an overwhelming majority of teachers. Based on these criteria, 7 BATs were obtained: 1) reward from behavior, 2) reward from source, 3) personal responsibility, 4) expert, 5) self-esteem, 6) altruism, and 7) duty (see Table 2).

The same 7 BATs obtained with teacher use also resulted for teacher effectiveness (see Table 3). That is, teachers perceived that the BATs they used were the same BATs they perceived as effective ( $\bar{X} > 3.0$ , frequency  $> 60\%$ ). Pearson  $r$  correlations between each obtained category of teacher use and effectiveness indicated a significant positive relationship for all BATs ( $p < .0001$ ; see Table 4).

Question 2 focused on what types of BATs teachers perceived their students to use and find effective in controlling their teacher's behavior in the classroom. Imposing the same criteria ( $\bar{X} > 3.0$ , frequency  $> 60\%$ ), teachers

reported that their students infrequently or seldom used any of the proposed BATs nor was a BAT perceived as particularly effective when it was employed.

Question 3 was concerned with four potential predictors of those behavior alteration techniques used and found effective in controlling student behavior: gender, number of years teaching, grade level usually taught, and teacher job satisfaction. In order to test these relationships, the 7 obtained BATs that teachers reported they use and find effective in controlling student behavior served as separate dependent variables. Individual AOV's indicated that overall, no meaningful results were obtained. Only three of the tests were significant at the .05 level across all analyses: female teachers perceived the duty BAT to be more effective than males ( $R^2=.02$ ); more satisfied teachers employed the altruism BAT than less satisfied teachers ( $R^2=.03$ ); and teachers in grades K-6 employed the reward from source BAT more often than teachers from other grade levels ( $R^2=.06$ ). Based on repeated tests as well as low variance obtained with those variables determined to be significant, these results should be interpreted as spurious and thus, not meaningful. Based on the results of this study then, teacher use and effectiveness of any given behavior alteration technique does not appear to be a function of the variables examined.

#### DISCUSSION

The primary goal of this study, a third in a series of programmed research, was to identify behavior alteration techniques (BATs) employed in classroom management. While Studies I and II relied on the bases of power from French & Raven's (1968) typology, Study III was designed to further explore teachers' use of power by extending the existing list of power strategies directly applicable to the classroom. Consistent with the objective

of this study, findings suggest that previous strategies need to be recast into classroom-relevant BATs. Teachers reported the use and applicability of 7 BATs for classroom management.

1. Reward from Behavior. Based on the configuration of BAMS (see Table 1, Item #1), this BAT promotes teacher attempts to elicit specific student behaviors by suggesting that such behaviors will be inherently rewarding. Employment of this strategy points out to the student that rewarding consequences are derived directly from engaging in the new behavior. This "try it, you'll like it" approach is likely in situations where students are reluctant to engage in innovative behavior which represents deviations from older ways of doing things. It would seem to be particularly relevant when students are resistant to the "new teacher" or a new learning experience.

2. Reward from Source. The BAMS that reflect this BAT (see Table 1, Item #7) combine into another reward-type appeal. Teachers who use this BAT offer direct rewards for student compliance. It should be noted that this BAT most closely resembles French & Raven's (1968) reward power. That is, the students expect to be rewarded by the teacher for complying with the teacher's influence attempt. Illustrations of this BAT would be found in learning environments where the teacher promises A marks on assignments and special tokens for "good" behavior.

3. Personal Responsibility. BAMS within this category suggest that compliance is derived from the students' sense of responsibility (see Table 1, Item #9). That is, as members of the class, students must share in assuming the responsibilities of the class. Teachers who employ this BAT direct appeals that emphasize the student's unique abilities in relation to other class members. By pointing out that "there's no one else who can do it," the student is obliged to comply in order to meet peer expectations and demands.

4. Expert. Like French and Raven's (1968) notion of expert power, the BAMS that reflect this BAT indicate that students perceive the teacher to be competent and knowledgeable in specific areas (see Table 1, Item #10). Compliance requires the perception that the teacher is qualified to request the particular behavior in question. This BAT would probably be demonstrated when the teacher dictates the "best way" to solve a math problem; outline an oral report; shoot a basket or offers other procedural guidance as a function of his/her expertise.

5. Self-Esteem. Similar to BATs 1 and 2, the BAMS that represent this BAT focus on student rewards for compliance (see Table 1, Item #12). In this case, the source of reward is the students' self-esteem. The teacher who employs this BAT appeals to the student's sense of self-worth relative to a given task. The teacher's assertion that "you're good at it" encourages student compliance by positively reinforcing particular student qualities demonstrated through performance. Given the current instructional literature indicates that student self-esteem is a major predictor of achievement, teachers who use this BAT predominantly, may be structuring the "optimal" learning environment.

6. Altruism. Similar to the "personal responsibility" BAT, the BAMS that reflect this BAT appeal to the student's awareness and commitment to other members of the class (see Table 1, Item #15). Altruism differs from the former BAT, however, by omitting reference to the student's special performance qualities. Instead, this BAT suggests that others will be happier or that others will benefit through the student's compliance. By appealing to a student's concern for the welfare of others in the class, the teacher discourages egocentrism and encourages an unselfish support for others (i.e., resulting in student compliance). This BAT would surface

during teacher attempts to motivate students to help each other in the learning process.

7. Duty. The BATs that constitute this BAT further extend the student's recognition and commitment to class members represented in both the "personal responsibility" and "altruism" BATs (see Table 1, Item #17). It defines the student as a member of the class and, as a member, the student has certain responsibilities to behave appropriately. Without his/her compliance, the rest of the class cannot achieve. Group interdependence is explicit in this BAT. Each and every student has a duty to cooperate so that everyone succeeds. The teacher who uses this appeal promotes a team spirit, asserting that "we're all in this together." The "duty" BAT is probably evidenced during the teacher's coordination of group projects, team competitions, and other class activities.

Further interpretation of the 7 BATs served to illustrate their uniqueness and applicability in classroom management. Unlike previous power and compliance-gaining typologies, the BATs teachers report they use and find effective in the classroom do not reflect punishment-oriented techniques nor do they rely exclusively on direct, individual appeals. Our results suggest 1) that teachers employ primarily positive reward-type BATs and 2) that they frequently make use of the student's "audience" to effect change.

Finding that none of the obtained BATs selected by teachers refer to punishing or negative consequences as a function of non-compliance is extremely interesting. More to the point, three of the BATs (i.e., reward from behavior, reward from source, and self-esteem), promise positive outcomes. Moreover, while the other BATs do not explicitly refer to negative or positive consequences, rewards are generally implicit in compliance. It appears that despite teachers' "preference" to employ punishing strategies to control student behavior (Siggers, 1980), either teachers are unwilling to

report they use punishment or they actually avoid using such strategies.

The results of this study also indicate that teachers report using directed individual appeals (i.e., reward from behavior, reward from source, expert, and self-esteem), but also rely on mediated appeals or what we call, "student audience effects." Personal responsibility, altruism, and duty all gain compliance by calling attention to the student's "public." That is, the student is reminded of his/her responsibility to and interdependence with the other class members. These appeals are mediational since the teacher indirectly affects a particular student's behavior by referencing the student's relationship to the rest of the class. Thus by implication, the class pressures the student to alter his/her behavior.

Important to our research program, the 7 BATs are consistent with findings on teachers' use of power in the classroom. In Studies I and II, McCroskey and Richmond (1983) and Richmond and McCroskey (in press) reported that teachers use primarily referent, expert, and reward power in controlling student behavior. Similarly, reward from behavior, reward from source, and self-esteem BATs emphasize positive consequences for compliance, corresponding with the French and Raven's (1968) reward power base. However, McCroskey and Richmond (1983) limit the definition of reward power by identifying the teacher as the only source of reward. Only one of our BATs reflected this confining perspective--reward from source. The other two BATs employed by teachers indicate that the student's behavior is an additional source of reward (e.g., "It will make you happy"), or that the student is intrinsically rewarded (e.g., "You'll feel good about yourself if you do it"). Finally, these BATs differ from McCroskey and Richmond's interpretation of reward power by omitting any BAT that refers to negative reinforcement. That is, removal of punishing consequences is neither explicit nor implied in these reward-type BATs.

The expert BAT that teachers reported they use and find effective is similar to the expert based power identified in the results of both Studies I and II (McCroskey and Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press). Pertinent to our research program, the findings of Study III replicate this frequent use of teacher competence as a source of student compliance. It is unfortunate that this BAT was found not to be a more significant predictor of cognitive or affective learning outcomes (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). Further explication of this relationship should be undertaken.

A third base of teacher power, referent, closely approximates our altruism, duty, and personal responsibility BATs. While referent power is defined as a student's willingness to comply in order to please or identify with the teacher, these BATs rely on other class members as sources of referent power. That is, the teacher who employs these three BATs directs the source of power to the group or the student's "audience." BATs that reflect these BATs (e.g., "It will make others happy if you do;" "Your group needs it done;" and "People are depending on you"), all focus on "student audience effects." The student complies as a function of his/her desire to please or identify with his/her peers. While previously defined referent power is direct and teacher-based, this redefinition posits a mediated, audience basis for referent power.

Efforts to determine whether teachers perceive their students employing similar BATs on their teachers were disappointing, but not altogether surprising. Results indicated that teachers did not perceive their students to frequently use any of the BATs nor were the BATs perceived as effective when students occasionally employed them. Two alternative explanations are offered which can account for these findings. First, teachers may fail to accurately report the BATs their students use since teachers are predisposed

to define themselves as sources of power in the teacher-student relationship. Moreover, teachers are not likely to report that any student manipulation is particularly effective in controlling their own behavior in the classroom. Thus, teachers may either fail to recognize strategic attempts to control their own behavior or simply disregard such attempts. Secondly, the BAMS representative of each BAT may not be applicable to student strategies to manipulate teachers. In the classroom the student must function in a clearly defined legitimate-based power relationship with his/her teacher. That is, the teacher's assigned role is to make certain demands of the student. In turn, the student may employ strategies to resist those demands. Resistance-type BATs may differ in kind from teacher-initiated BATs. Regardless of the explanation, both interpretations require an examination of those resistance-type BATs students report they use and find effective in controlling their teachers.

Although a number of teacher variables would be expected to influence a teacher's selection and perceived effectiveness of BATs employed in the classroom, those examined in this study do not appear to be relevant. Results indicated that instructor gender, grade level, years taught, and satisfaction with the teaching profession were not meaningful predictors of these particular BATs. Several construct-specific explanations are offered to account for these findings.

At the very least, we might expect male teachers to use more aggressive or punishment-type BATs than female teachers. Males are socially conditioned to be more active and assertive, while females are conditioned to be more passive and responsive. Regardless, both sexes reported that they use primarily positive or reward-type BATs. Perhaps male teachers are more likely to assertively define rules and consequences for non-compliance early in the year. This would preclude the need to employ punishment. On the other hand,

a male teacher's physical size may indirectly communicate coercive compliance. Either explanation may account for males' reported infrequent use of punishment-type BATs.

Developmentally, we would expect students to respond differentially to BATs across grade levels. Yet, teachers use of BATs in the classroom was not a function of the grade level taught. The BATs generated for this study may be strategies that are employed across all grade levels. Certainly the BAMs that configure together to represent each BAT reflect this universality in classroom management. Another reason for no differences among grade levels may be found in the wording of each BAM. Teacher recall of the differential use of BATs may require the inclusion of actual messages used in conversation with second graders (as opposed to high school seniors).

Interpreting no significant differences in teacher BATs as a function of the number of years taught is troublesome. We may not anticipate teachers selecting for use different BATs as a function of their experience. However, we would expect less experienced teachers to be less effective in the employment of each strategy than more experienced teachers. Experienced teachers should be able to generate more sophisticated BAMs. Stated differently, experienced teachers should be more communicatively competent in the actual implementation of specific BATs resulting in consistently more effective student control. In this case, we would suggest that perceived effectiveness is relative. Having little or no prior history with classroom management, an inexperienced teacher may have no comparative basis to critically assess his/her perceived effectiveness. As a result, the inexperienced teacher may perceive that he/she is equally effective in using the same BATs as an experienced teacher simply because the "new" teacher may not realistically understand or expect optimal standards for effectively managed classrooms.

Finally, teacher use and effectiveness of BATs were not found to be related to teacher job satisfaction. This result is easily explained. Satisfaction with the teaching profession is a function of several factors, such as pay, co-workers, administrators, etc. While these factors are normally beyond the influence of teachers, classroom management is primarily within the domain of teacher control. Dissatisfied teachers then, may employ the same BATs and perceive those BATs to be effective in their efforts to optimize satisfaction with their work environments. In short, teachers need not like their jobs to be good at classroom teaching.

A number of program-relevant issues were uncovered in this study. Subsequent projects have been designed to address several of these research concerns. Investigations are underway which focus on 1) additional teacher generated BATs and BAMs, 2) BATs teachers employ at different points in time during the school year, 3) varying classroom situations within which different BATs are used, 4) student perceptions and evaluations of teacher BATs, and 5) grade dependent, resistance-type student strategies. The final outcomes of these and other investigations of this type should contribute to the formulation of suitable applied and theoretic frameworks for understanding power in the classroom.

#### FOOTNOTE

<sup>1</sup>The items on this measure were: 1) In general, how often do you think things between you and your students are going well? Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Usually, Always 2) Have you ever considered quitting teaching? Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Usually, Always 3) Everything considered, how satisfying has teaching been for you? Very Satisfying, Satisfying, Somewhat Satisfying, Somewhat Dissatisfying, Dissatisfying, Very Dissatisfying 4) If you had your life to live over, do you think you would go into teaching as a profession? Definitely, Probably, Possibly, Probably Not, Definitely Not. Preliminary analysis indicated item one did not correlate highly with the remaining items. Subsequent analyses were conducted with and without this item separately. Alpha reliability of the 4-item measure is .55, of the 3-item measure it is .73.

Table 1

Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) and Messages (BAMs)

| BATs                           | BAMs                                                                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Reward from Behavior        | You will enjoy it. You will get a reward if you do. It will make you happy. It will help you. You will benefit if you do.                      |
| 2. Reward from Others          | Others will think highly of you if you do. Others will like you if you do. Others will respect you if you do.                                  |
| 3. Punishment from Source      | I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you if you don't. I will continue doing bad things to you if you don't.           |
| 4. Referent-Model              | This is the way I always do it. People who are like me do it. People you respect do it.                                                        |
| 5. Legitimate-Higher Authority | Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. I don't know why, you just have to do it.            |
| 6. Guilt                       | If you don't, others will be hurt. If you don't others will be unhappy. Others will be harmed if you don't.                                    |
| 7. Reward from Source          | I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you if you do. I will continue to reward you if you do.                       |
| 8. Normative Rules             | Everyone else does it. We voted, and the majority rules. Society expects you to do it. All of your friends are doing it.                       |
| 9. Personal Responsibility     | It is your responsibility. It is your obligation. There is no one else that can do it. People are depending on you.                            |
| 10. Expert                     | From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has worked for me, it should work for you too. |
| 11. Punishment from Behavior   | You will lose if you don't. You will be punished if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't.                |
| 12. Self-Esteem                | You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You are good at it.                                             |
| 13. Debt                       | You owe me one. It's your turn. You promised to do it. I did it the last time.                                                                 |

Table 1 (continued)

| BATs                               | BAMs                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 14. Personal Relationship-Negative | I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you if you don't. I will think less of you if you don't.                                |
| 15. Altruism                       | If you do this it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do.                                          |
| 16. Personal Relationship-Positive | I will like you better if you do. I will respect you if you do. I will think more highly of you if you do. I will appreciate you more if you do. |
| 17. Duty                           | Your group needs it done. Our group depends on you. Our group will be hurt if you don't.                                                         |
| 18. Legitimate-Personal Authority  | Because I told you to. Just do it. You have to do it, it's required. You don't have a choice.                                                    |

Table 2  
Table of Means for Teachers' Use of BATs  
(N=204)

| Category                | Item | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. | f   | % of Total |
|-------------------------|------|-----------|------|-----|------------|
| Reward from Behavior    | 1    | 3.41      | .94  | 174 | 85.30      |
| Reward from Source      | 7    | 3.01      | 1.17 | 142 | 69.61      |
| Personal Responsibility | 9    | 3.53      | 1.04 | 178 | 87.26      |
| Expert                  | 10   | 3.21      | 1.12 | 158 | 77.45      |
| Self-Esteem             | 12   | 3.95      | .95  | 191 | 93.63      |
| Altruism                | 15   | 3.20      | 1.01 | 153 | 75.00      |
| Duty                    | 17   | 3.06      | 1.00 | 153 | 75.00      |

Table 3  
Table of Means for Teachers' Effectiveness of BATs  
(N=204)

| Category                | Item | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. | f   | % of Total |
|-------------------------|------|-----------|------|-----|------------|
| Reward from Behavior    | 1    | 3.29      | .83  | 179 | 88.18      |
| Reward from Source      | 7    | 3.26      | 1.09 | 165 | 82.09      |
| Personal Responsibility | 9    | 3.27      | .91  | 175 | 86.21      |
| Expert                  | 10   | 3.08      | 1.01 | 157 | 77.72      |
| Self-Esteem             | 12   | 3.88      | .85  | 193 | 95.07      |
| Altruism                | 15   | 3.18      | .89  | 165 | 81.64      |
| Duty                    | 17   | 3.07      | .91  | 162 | 80.20      |

Table 4  
Correlation Coefficients for Teacher Use and Effectiveness\*

| Items**     | 1   | 7   | 9   | 10  | 12  | 15  | 17  |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Correlation | .64 | .80 | .62 | .76 | .69 | .64 | .65 |

\*All correlations are significant at  $p < .0001$ .

\*\*See Table 1 for BAT items.

## REFERENCES

- Andersen, J. F. Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1979.
- Arlin, M. Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 42-56.
- Borg, W. R. & Ascione, F. R. Changing on-task, off-task, and disruptive pupil behavior in elementary mainstreaming classrooms. Journal of Educational Research, 1979, 72, 243-252.
- Breuning, S. E. Precision teaching in the high school classroom: A necessary step towards maximizing teacher effectiveness and student performance. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 125-140.
- Branan, J. M. Negative human interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 81-82.
- Check, J. F. Classroom discipline--where are we now? Education, 1979, 100, 134-137.
- Cody, M. J., McLaughlin, M. L., & Jordan, W. J. A multi-dimensional scaling of three sets of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Quarterly, 1980, 28, 34-46.
- Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the year in junior high school classrooms. Austin, Texas: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, Report No. 6107, 1980.
- Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38, 342-347.
- Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. Beginning school. Educational Horizons, 1979, 57, 164-168.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Carwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1968.
- Gallup, G. H. Ninth Annual Gallup Poll: What does the public think of the schools? Today's Education, 1977, 66, 27-31.
- Good, T. L., & Beckerman, T. M. Time-on-task: A naturalistic study in sixth-grade classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 1978, 78, 193-201.
- Harris, M. B. Classroom uses of behavior modification. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.

- Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension, and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 4. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1980.
- Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. Signal systems of lesson settings and the task-related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 554-562.
- Krantz, M., & Scarth, L. Task persistence and adult assistance in the preschool. Child Development, 1979, 50, 578-581.
- Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. Sociometry, 1967, 30, 350-364.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. Communication Education, 1983, 32, 175-184.
- Miller, G. R., Boster, F., Roloff, M., & Seibold, D. Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 37-51.
- Mouly, G. J. Psychology for effective teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973, p. 483.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. Communication Education, in press.
- Schenck-Hamlin, W. J., Wiseman, R. L., & Georgacarakos, G. N. A model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Quarterly, 1982, 30, 92-100.
- Shrigley, R. L. Strategies in classroom management. Educational Digest, 1979, 45, 7-10.
- Siggers, W. W. Changing teacher correcting behavior: Using aversive and positive contingencies. Educational Research Quarterly, 1980, 5, 25-32.
- Spillman, C. V. Classroom management: Mystery or mastery? Education, 1980, 101, 41-45.
- Wittich, W. A., & Schuller, C. F. Instructional technology: Its nature and use. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.